संदर्भ सं. / **Ref. No:**
POD/Application No /202021023694

प्रेषण दिनांक / **Date of Dispatch:**
20/01/2021

सेवा में, / To

आवेदक /**Applicant:**
ARCHANA GHOTKAR

Registerd Address For Service :TARUN KHURANA, KHURANA & KHURANA, Advocates and IP Attorneys E-13, UPSIDC, Site-IV, Behind Grand Venice, Kasna Road, Greater Noida 201310, UP, National Capital Region, India.. Email: info@khuranaandkhurana.com

विपक्षी /**Opponent:**
NA

ई-मेल प्रेषित /**Email Sent to:**
info@khuranaandkhurana.com

विषय: आवेदन संख्या 202021023694 के संदर्भ में सुनवाई नोटिस
Sub: Hearing Notice in Reference of Application No. 202021023694

सुनवाई स्थल / **Hearing Location:** Through Video Conferencing
सुनवाई दिनांक व समय / **Hearing Date & Time:** 25/03/2021 / 15:00 HRS(IST) for (1h)
नियंत्रक ईमेल /**Controller's EmailId:** vikas.ipo@nic.in

आपके द्वारा प्रथम परीक्षण रिपोर्ट/ अनुवर्ती परीक्षण रिपोर्ट के उत्तर के संदर्भ में, दिनांक 25/03/2021 को 15:00 HRS(IST) for (1h) बजे विडियो कॉन्फ्रेंसिंग मामले में Hearing U/S (14) सुनवाई तय की गयी है। अतः, आपको उपरोक्त दिनांक व समय पर नियंत्रक के समक्ष सुनवाई हेतु उपस्थित होना है।

With reference to your reply to the First examination Report/Subsequent Examination Report, a Hearing U/S (14) hearing has been scheduled in the matter through Video Conferencing on 25/03/2021 at 15:00 HRS(IST) for (1h) . You are therefore, required to appear before the Controller for the hearing on said date and time.

इस आवेदन को पेटेंट अनुदान हेतु क्रम में लाने की अंतिम तिथि से पूर्व / अंतिम तिथि के उपरांत, निम्नलिखित आपत्तियां अभी भी शेष हैं।
The following objection(s) are still outstanding before / after the expiry of last date for putting this application in order for grant of patent.

Vikas Gupta
Assistant Controller of Patents & Designs

*दिनांक/समय, स्थल, स्थिति व सुनवाई के बारे में अन्य विवरण के लिए: कृपया निम्नलिखित यूआरएल देखें http://ipindiaservices.gov.in/PatentCauseList
Please refer to the following URL for: Date/Time, Venue, Status and other details about the Hearing
http://ipindiaservices.gov.in/PatentCauseList

टिप्पणी:- विडियो कॉन्फ्रेंसिंग के माध्यम से सुनवाई के समय के संबंध में मेल अलग से भेजी जाएगी।
Note:- Separate mail will be sent regarding the time of the Hearing through Video Conference.

* Hearing Objections are attached.

Objections

Invention u/s 2(1)(j)

1.

Subject matter of claims as claimed in instant application does not constitute an invention under section 2(1)(ja) of the Patents Act, 1970 (as amended) because it does not involve Inventive Step in view of following documents:

D1: US20120265779A1 (18/10/2012)

D2: "Finding Similar Patents Through Semantic Query Expansion" By Pawan Sharma et. al. (21/08/2015)(Pages 390-395)

D3: CN102253982A (23-11-2011)

The subject matter of D1 discloses systems, methods and computer-storage media are provided for identifying query formulation suggestions in response to receiving a search query. A portion of a search query is received. Query formulation suggestions are identified by semantically analyzing the search query. The query formulation suggestions are used to further formulate the received search query. The query formulation suggestions include semantic-pattern-based query suggestions that are derived from semantic query patterns, one or more entities, and information associated with these entities. The query formulation suggestions are transmitted for presentation. (Abstract, paragraphs [0012]-[0020],[0026]-[0033],[0040]-[0062],[0071], fig 1,2)

The subject matter of D2 discloses about finding similar patents by expanding the user query semantically. It investigates how the patent retrieval system can be improved by using words which have the same expression i.e. semantically similar. Semantic expansion of a query can provide high quality results and reduce the complex search process. Expansion technique semantically increases the number of words in a query which gives a better quality of retrieval result. The longer the query abstract, the higher the result accuracy rate. Semantic – based similarity measures is using knowledge sources to measure similarity based on the content of the words rather than frequency of occurrence. (see whole document)

The subject matter of D3 discloses a query suggestion method based on query semantics and click-through data, which comprises the following steps of: 1, preprocessing collected query log data; 2, preprocessing participles and filtering stop words of query data input by a user; 3, calculating similarity of log information in a user query data string and a query log library one by one; 4, calculating semantic relativity of the log information in the user query data string and the query log library one by one on the basis of a word concept relevancy calculation method in the HowNet; 5, fusing the similarity and the semantic relativity, and calculating query semantic relativity of each piece of log information in the user query data string and the query log library; and 6, taking Top-N out and recommending to the user according to a descending relativity sequence in the step 5. By the method, query ambiguity can be effectively eliminated, an input error can be reminded, and usability and interactivity of an information retrieval system are improved. (whole document)

The subject matter of claimed invention lacks inventive step in view of cited documents D1-D3.

Non-Patentability u/s 3

1. Without prejudice to objection U/S 2(1) (j), the apparatus and system mentioned in claims 1-7 have no inventive constructional feature. It is comprised of conventional systems. The different conventional systems are processors, storage devices, servers, computer networks. These systems as such do not fall into the definition of a system. It is not evinced if said claims define any technical features or technical advance thereof, and apparently attract provisions U/S 3 (k) of the Act. Hence, said claims are not allowed.

2. As worded the method claimed in claim 8 appears to be a mere algorithm implemented through software. In other words the claimed method is a mere software application/product and hence not patentable u/s 3(K) of Independent claims 9 and 10 contain the same subject matter as claim 1. Therefore, the objection with respect to novelty also applies mutatis mutandis to these claims also.